REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended in order to incorporate the feature of Claim 4. Claim 4 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 5 is amended to be in independent form so as to place Claims 5-7 in allowable form, the allowance of Claims 5-7 is respectfully requested. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated February 12, 2008.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Methley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,354,255). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the present amendment to Claim 1 and the following remarks.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of Claim 4. Claim 4 recites that the intake camshaft rotates by moving upward on the side where the intake camshaft faces the exhaust valve operating device. It is respectfully submitted that Methley et al. fails to teach or suggest how a camshaft having a cam lobe (22) fixed thereon rotates. The disclosure of how the camshaft rotates is not found at column 3, lines 15 to 25. In view of the amendment to Claim 1, and the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by Shimizu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,425,357). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the present amendment to the Claim 1 and the following remarks.

It is respectfully submitted that the engine of Shimizu et al. is being mischaracterized. The Office Action relies on FIG. 2 of Shimizu et al. for determining the relative positions of the intake and exhaust camshafts. If a cylinder axis is drawn in FIG. 2 for the cylinder having piston (6), and then a line is drawn perpendicular to the cylinder axis which passes thorough the axis of exhaust cam shaft (46), it will also pass through the axis of intake camshaft (45). Therefore, it appears as though the camshafts are equal in position along the cylinder axis relative to the combustion chamber. It is respectfully submitted that Shimizu et al. does not disclose or suggest every feature of the claimed invention. In view of the amendment to Claim 1, and the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

In the Office Action, Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Methley et al. in view of JP 5,39707.

In the Office Action, Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Methley et al. in view of JP 11-107855.

In the Office Action, Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shimizu et al. in view of JP 5,39707.

In the Office Action, Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. in view of JP 11-10755.

Reconsideration and removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C.§103 are respectfully requested in view of the present amendment to the Claim I and the following remarks.

Claim 3 depends from Claim 1. In view of the amendment to Claim 1, and the above remarks, removal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Methley et al. Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the present amendment to Claim 1 and the following remarks.

Specifically, the Office Action states that Methley et al. discloses that the cam lobe causes to rotate the rocker (26) clockwise as viewed (column 3, lines 15 to 25). It is respectfully submitted that knowing the direction of rotation of the rocker (26) would <u>not</u> result in knowing the direction of rotation of the intake camshaft having lobe (22), as rotation of the intake camshaft in either direction would cause the rocker (26) to rotate clockwise when the lobe encounters the follower.

In view of the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Claims 1-3 as well as Claims 5-7, as amended, are believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, OUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

James N. Baker, Reg. No. 40,899

for Mel R. Quintos Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 31,898

MRQ/JNB/ak

Atty. Docket No. 060533 Suite 400 1420 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 659-2930 23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosure:

Petition for Extension of Time